



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,102	01/31/2002	Cary Lee Bates	END920010052US1	9951
23550	7590	08/08/2006	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC			BASOM, BLAINE T	
75 STATE STREET			ART UNIT	
14TH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
ALBANY, NY 12207			2173	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,102

Applicant(s)

BATES ET AL.

Examiner

Blaine Basom

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed under 37 CFR §1.53(d) for the instant application on 5/19/2006. The Applicants have properly set forth the RCE, which has been entered into the application, and an examination on the merits follows herewith.

Response to Arguments

The Examiner acknowledges the Applicants' amendments to claims 1, 4-6, 9-10, 13, 17, 21, and 23. Regarding claims 1, 9, 17, 21, and 23, the Applicants contend that Carroll teaches extending a selected first set of data, but argue that Carroll fails to teach selecting a second set of data, wherein the second set of data may be selected anywhere within the application irrespective of the location of the first set of data, as is claimed. In response, the Examiner respectfully notes that, while Carroll does in fact teach extending a selected region, this is not the sole teaching of Carroll; Carroll's teachings are not limited to extending previously-selected regions (see e.g. column 4, line 53 – column 5, line 8). Rather, as is described more fully hereafter, Carroll teaches that the user selects an "active select region" using a positional indicator, e.g. a cursor, to indicate the terminal points of the region (see e.g. column 3, line 32 – column 4, line 34). While this active select region is being selected by the user, any previously-selected regions remain selected (see e.g. column 3, line 51 – column 4, line 20). Since the user can freely move the positional indicator to any location, as is well known in the art, it is clear that the active select region may be located anywhere chosen by the user (i.e. the user may arbitrarily select any data),

irrespective of any previously-selected regions. The Examiner therefore maintains that Carroll teaches selecting a second set of data within an application, wherein a first set of data remains selected during the selection of the second set of data, and wherein the second set of data may be selected anywhere within the application irrespective of a location of the first set of data.

Regarding claims 4, 10, 17, 21, and 23, the Applicants argue that Carroll fails to teach selecting, in a distinctive manner, a portion of a selected set of data, wherein the selected set of data remains selected during the selection of the portion. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. As described *infra*, Carroll teaches selecting an active select region, which comprises all or part of a previously-selected region, and which is displayed in a different manner (e.g. in a different color) than the previously-selected region (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19 of Carroll). Moreover, Carroll discloses that the previously-selected region remains selected during selection of the active selection region (see e.g. column 3, line 51 – column 4, line 19). Selecting such an active select region thus entails selecting, in a distinctive manner, a first portion of the previously-selected region, wherein the previously-selected region remains selected during the selection of the first portion.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, the Applicants argue that Carroll fails to teach or suggest a method that is adapted to allow selection of second set of data that is non-contiguous with a first set of data, as is claimed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. As described above, Carroll teaches selecting a second set of data within an application, wherein the second set of data may be selected anywhere within the application irrespective of a location of a first selected set of data. As such, the second set of data need not be contiguous with the first set of data.

The Applicants' arguments have thus been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 9, 17, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification discloses a method for selecting a first set of data within an application and selecting a second set of data within the application, wherein the method is adapted to allow selection of the second set of data that is non-contiguous with the first set of data (see e.g. page 9, line 19 – page 10, line 13). The specification, however, does not explicitly disclose or suggest that the method is adapted to allow selecting of the second set of data *anywhere* within the application, irrespective of a location of the first set of data, as is expressed in each of claims 1, 9, 17, 21, and 23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,683,631, which is attributed to Carroll.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

In reference to claim 1, Carroll teaches selecting a first set of data within an application (e.g. a word processing application) and selecting a second set of data within the application, wherein the first set of data remains selected during the selection of the second set of data (for example, see figure 6: elements 104 and 106 each represent a selected set of data). It is readily apparent that the first set need not be contiguous with the second set. For example, Carroll discloses that the user selects data by first positioning a positional indicator, e.g. a cursor, within the application and then entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes or depression of a mouse key) to initiate the selection of data (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines

Art Unit: 2173

1-19). In response, a “begin active select delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator when the input occurred (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). The user then moves the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an “active select region” between the begin active select delimiter and the positional indicator, the active select region being displayed in a different manner (e.g. in a different color) than any previously-selected data, which remains selected (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). Finally, the user enters a second input (e.g. a second set of keystrokes) to indicate termination of the selection of data, wherein response, an “end active set delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator when this second input occurred (see column 3, lines 32-53; and column 4, lines 1-30). Depending on the positional relationship between the begin active set delimiter and the end active set delimiter, the active select region, including any previously-selected data, is converted into a selected region; if the begin active set delimiter is to the left of or above the end active set delimiter (i.e. the user moved the cursor down and/or to the right), then the active select region is converted to a selected region (see e.g. column 3, lines 53-67). The location of a selected region is thus dependent on the location of the active selected region, which is dependent upon the location of the positional indicator when the first and second input occurs. And since the user can freely move the positional indicator, e.g. cursor, to any location – as is well known in the art – it is clear that the active selected regions may be located anywhere chosen by the user (i.e. the user may arbitrarily select any data), irrespective of any previously-selected regions. Carroll thus teaches a method like that of claim 1, wherein the method is adapted to allow selecting of a second set of data anywhere within the application irrespective of the location of a first set of data.

Regarding claim 2, Carroll teaches performing a predetermined keystroke after selecting a first set of data, wherein the keystroke allows the first data set to remain selected during the selection of a second set of data (for example, see column 3, line 35 – column 4, line 20).

Regarding claim 3, Carroll teaches processing a selected region via functions such as copy, print, or cut (see e.g. column 1, lines 29-30). Moreover, Carroll is directed to creating multiple simultaneously-selected regions, such that these regions may be processed without selecting and processing each region separately (for example, see column 2, lines 4-8). It is therefore understood that the user may select and simultaneously copy multiple selected sets of data and then simultaneously print, i.e. paste, the multiple sets of data to a predetermined area (see e.g. column 5, lines 8-22).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Carroll discloses that the user selects data by first positioning a positional indicator, e.g. a cursor, and then entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes or depression of a mouse key) to initiate the selection of data (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). In response, a “begin active select delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator when the input occurred (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). The user then moves the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an “active select region” between the begin active select delimiter and the positional indicator, the active select region being displayed in a different manner (e.g. in a different color) than any previously-selected data, which remains selected (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). Carroll further discloses that such an active select region may include a portion of the previously-selected data (see e.g. column 3, lines 51-67). Accordingly, Carroll teaches selecting (i.e. as an active select region) in a distinctive manner (e.g. in a different color) a first portion of

one of the selected sets of data, wherein the selected set of data remains selected during the selection of the first portion. As the user moves the positional indicator, the active select region becomes enlarged, and if the cursor is within a previously-selected region, additional portions of the previously-selected region become selected, i.e. become part of the active select region. Accordingly, Carroll further teaches selecting, in a distinctive manner, a second portion of the one of the selected set of data, wherein the first portion remains selected during the selection of the second portion based upon a predetermined keystroke (i.e. based on the above-described second input), and then manipulating the selected portions.

With respect to claim 6, Carroll teaches selecting a first set of data within an application (e.g. a word processing application) and selecting a second set of data within the application, wherein the first set of data remains selected during the selection of the second set of data, as is described above. It is readily apparent that the first set need not be contiguous with the second set. For example, as shown above in the discussion concerning claim 1, Carroll discloses that the user selects data in an application by: first positioning a positional indicator (e.g. a cursor) within the application; entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes) to initiate the selection of data, whereby a "begin active select delimiter" is generated at the location of the positional indicator; moving the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an "active select region" between the begin active select delimiter and the positional indicator; and entering a second input (e.g. a second set of keystrokes) to indicate termination of the selection of data, whereby an "end active set delimiter" is generated at the location of the positional indicator, and whereby the active select region is converted into a selected region depending on the positional relationship between the begin active set delimiter and the end active set delimiter. The location

Art Unit: 2173

of such a selected region is thus dependent only on the location of the active selected region, or in other words, the location of a selected region is dependent upon the location of the positional indicator when the first and second input occurs. Since the user can freely move the positional indicator to any location – as is well known in the art – it is clear that the selected region may be located anywhere chosen by the user, and need not be contiguous with a previously-selected region.

Concerning claim 7, Carroll discloses that the data selected by the user is text data (see e.g. column 3, lines 15-17).

As per claim 8, Carroll teaches deselecting text when a positional indicator is manipulated in a second direction (see e.g. column 2, lines 11-13; and column 3, lines 51-67). That is, a user may deselect a selected set of data.

In reference to claim 9, Carroll teaches providing an application (e.g. a word processing application) for the manipulation of data, and selecting a first set of data within the application (for example, see figure 1: element 106 represents a first selected set of data). Carroll further teaches performing a predetermined keystroke (to generate a “begin active set delimiter”) and selecting a set of data (i.e. a second set of data) within the application, whereby any previously-selected data (i.e. the first set of data) remains selected during the selection of the set (see e.g. column 3, line 33 – column 4, line 34). In particular, as shown above in the discussion concerning claim 1, Carroll discloses that the user selects a set of data (e.g. the second set of data) by: positioning a positional indicator, e.g. a cursor, within the application and then entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes) to initiate the selection of data, wherein response, a “begin active select delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator

Art Unit: 2173

when the input occurred; moving the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an “active select region” between the begin active select delimiter and the positional indicator, the active select region being displayed in a different manner (e.g. in a different color) than any previously-selected data (e.g. a first selected set of data), which remains selected; entering a second input (e.g. a second set of keystrokes) to indicate termination of the selection of data, wherein response, an “end active set delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator when this second input occurred, and whereby the active select region is converted into a selected region if the begin active set delimiter is to the left of or above the end active set delimiter. The location of a selected region (e.g. the second set of data) is thus dependent on the location of the active selected region, i.e. the location of the positional indicator when the first and second input occurs. Since the user can freely move the positional indicator, e.g. cursor, to any location – as is well known in the art – it is clear that the selected region may be located anywhere chosen by the user (i.e. the user may arbitrarily select any data), irrespective of any previously-selected regions. Carroll thus teaches a method like that of claim 9, wherein the method is adapted to allow selecting of a second set of data anywhere within the application irrespective of the location of a first set of data.

Regarding claim 10, Carroll discloses that the user selects data by positioning a positional indicator, e.g. a cursor, and then entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes) to initiate the selection of data (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). In response, a “begin active select delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator when the input occurred (see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). The user then moves the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an “active select region” between the begin

Art Unit: 2173

active select delimiter and the positional indicator, the active select region being displayed in a different manner (e.g. in a different color) than any data region that's already been selected (for example, see column 3, lines 32-50; and column 4, lines 1-19). Carroll further discloses that such an active select region may include a portion of the previously-selected data region, which remains selected (see e.g. column 3, lines 51-67). Accordingly, it is apparent that selecting an active select region that includes a portion of a previously-selected set of data entails selecting (i.e. as the active select region) in a distinctive manner (e.g. in a different color) a first portion of one of the previously-selected sets of data, wherein the selected set of data remains selected during the selection of the first portion. As the user moves the positional indicator, the active select region becomes enlarged, and if the cursor is within the previously-selected set of data, additional portions of the previously-selected set become selected, i.e. become part of the active select region. Accordingly, Carroll further teaches selecting, in a distinctive manner, a second portion of the one of the selected set of data, wherein the first portion remains selected during the selection of the second portion based upon a second predetermined keystroke (e.g. based on the above-described second input, or lack thereof, indicating termination of the selection of data).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Carroll teaches processing a selected region via functions such as copy, print, or cut (see e.g. column 1, lines 29-30). The user may thus copy and print, i.e. paste, the multiple selected sets of data to a predetermined area (see e.g. column 5, lines 8-22). The user may further manipulate the selected sets of data in the predetermined area using the copy, print, and paste functions, as is known in the art.

With respect to claim 13, Carroll teaches selecting a first set of data within an application (e.g. a word processing application) and selecting a second set of data within the application,

wherein the first set of data remains selected during the selection of the second set of data, as is described above. It is readily apparent that the first set need not be contiguous with the second set. For example, as shown above in the discussion concerning claim 1, Carroll discloses that the user selects data in an application by: first positioning a positional indicator (e.g. a cursor) within the application; entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes) to initiate the selection of data, whereby a “begin active select delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator; moving the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an “active select region” between the begin active select delimiter and the positional indicator; and entering a second input (e.g. a second set of keystrokes) to indicate termination of the selection of data, whereby an “end active set delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator, and whereby the active select region is converted into a selected region depending on the positional relationship between the begin active set delimiter and the end active set delimiter. The location of such a selected region is thus dependent only on the location of the active selected region, or in other words, the location of a selected region is dependent upon the location of the positional indicator when the first and second input occurs. Since the user can freely move the positional indicator to any location – as is well known in the art – it is clear that the selected region may be located anywhere chosen by the user, and need not be contiguous with a previously-selected region, e.g. the first set of data.

Concerning claim 14, Carroll discloses that the data selected by the user is text data (see e.g. column 3, lines 15-17).

As per claim 15, Carroll teaches selecting a first set of text within an application (e.g. a word processing application) and selecting a second set of text within the application, wherein

the first set of text remains selected during the selection of the second set of text, as is described above. The text of the word processing application is arbitrary, and may comprise computer code (see e.g. column 4, lines 40-41).

As per claim 16, Carroll teaches deselecting text when a positional indicator is manipulated in a second direction (see e.g. column 2, lines 11-13; and column 3, lines 51-67). That is, a user may deselect a selected set of data.

In reference to claim 17, Carroll teaches providing an application (e.g. a word processing application) for the manipulation of data, and selecting a first set of data within the application (for example, see figure 1: element 106 represents a first selected set of data). The data displayed by the word processing application is arbitrary, and may comprise computer code (see e.g. column 4, lines 40-41). Carroll further teaches performing a predetermined keystroke (to generate a “begin active set delimiter”) and selecting a set of data (i.e. a second set of data) within the application, whereby any previously-selected data (i.e. the first set of data) remains selected during the selection of the set based on the keystroke (see e.g. column 3, line 33 – column 4, line 34). Additionally, Carroll discloses that an active select region may include a portion of a previously-selected data region (e.g. the first or second set of data), which remains selected (see e.g. column 3, lines 51-67). Accordingly, it is apparent that selecting an active select region that includes a portion of a previously-selected set of data entails selecting (i.e. as the active select region) in a distinctive manner (e.g. in a different color) a portion of one of the previously-selected sets of data, wherein the selected set of data remains selected during the selection of the first portion. Carroll also teaches processing such a selected region via functions such as copy, print, or cut (see e.g. column 1, lines 29-30). The user may thus copy and print,

Art Unit: 2173

i.e. paste, the multiple selected sets of data to a predetermined area (see e.g. column 5, lines 8-22), and may further manipulate the selected sets of data in the predetermined area using the copy, print, and paste functions, as is known in the art. As described above, the user selects data (e.g. the first data set, the second data set, or the portion) by: first positioning a positional indicator (e.g. a cursor) within the application; entering an input (e.g. a predetermined set of keystrokes) to initiate the selection of data, whereby a “begin active select delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator; moving the positional indicator, resulting in the creation of an “active select region” between the begin active select delimiter and the positional indicator; and entering a second input (e.g. a second set of keystrokes) to indicate termination of the selection of data, whereby an “end active set delimiter” is generated at the location of the positional indicator, and whereby the active select region is converted into a selected region depending on the positional relationship between the begin active set delimiter and the end active set delimiter. The location of such a selected region is thus dependent only on the location of the active selected region, or in other words, the location of a selected region is dependent upon the location of the positional indicator when the first and second input occurs. Since the user can freely move the positional indicator, e.g. cursor, to any location – as is well known in the art – it is clear that the selected regions may be located anywhere chosen by the user (i.e. the user may arbitrarily select any data), irrespective of any previously-selected regions. Carroll thus teaches a method like that of claim 17, wherein the method is adapted to allow selecting of a second set of data anywhere within the application irrespective of the location of a first set of data.

Regarding claims 18 and 19, Carroll teaches processing a selected region via functions such as copy, print, or cut (see e.g. column 1, lines 29-30). That is, the user may thus copy and cut the multiple selected sets of data, prior to pasting the data, as is known in the art.

Concerning claim 20, Carroll discloses that the data selected by the user is text data (see e.g. column 3, lines 15-17).

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Carroll teaches a method comprising: selecting a first set of data and a second set of data within an application (e.g. a word processing application), wherein the first set of data remains selected during the selection of the second set of data based upon a predetermined keystroke; and selecting, in a distinctive manner, a portion of one of the selected sets of data, wherein the one of the selected sets of data remains selected during the selection of the portion, and wherein selection of the second set of data is allowed anywhere within the application, irrespective of a location of the first set of data, as is shown above in the rejection for claim 17, for example. Carroll further discloses that such method steps may be implemented via program code stored on a recordable medium (see e.g. column 4, lines 47-52). Such a recordable medium comprising program code for implementing the method of Carroll is considered a program product, like that of claim 21. Additionally Carroll discloses that such a method may be implemented by a computer workstation (see e.g. column 2, line 55 – column 3, line 14). Such a workstation implementing the method of Carroll is considered a system, like that described in claim 23.

As per claims 22 and 24-26, Carroll teaches selecting a first set of text within an application (e.g. a word processing application) and selecting a second set of text within the application, wherein the first set of text remains selected during the selection of the second set of

Art Unit: 2173

text, as is described above. The text of the word processing application is arbitrary, and may comprise computer code (see e.g. column 4, lines 40-41). Carroll further teaches manipulating selected regions, or portions thereof, via functions such as copy, print, or cut (see e.g. column 1, lines 29-30). That is, the word processing application comprises code for copying the selected sets of data, cutting the selected sets of data, pasting the selected sets of data, and manipulating the selected portion of data. Moreover, the application may include functionality for deselecting a selected set of data, or portion thereof, when a positional indicator is manipulated in a second direction (see e.g. column 2, lines 11-13; and column 3, lines 51-67).

Conclusion

In responding to this Office Action, please note that the Examiner of record for this Application has changed. Please direct all future correspondence to Blaine Basom, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

btb
8/1/2006


TADESSE HAILU
Patent Examiner